



**Fw: Follow up from this afternoon's VA RMP call**

**Katherine Antos** to: David McGuigan, Hank Zygmunt, Lucinda Power, Ann Carkhuff, Mark Dubin, Richard Batiuk, Robert Koroncai, Lucinda Power,  
Cc: Jeffrey Corbin, Kelly Shenk

11/03/2010 06:04 PM

FYI - Lucinda please include in weekly update.

Jeff S - Please note that we successfully convinced va that they don't need a new RMP BMP.

Katherine Wallace Antos  
Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
410 Severn Ave., Suite 112  
Annapolis, MD 21403

(410) 295-1358

----- Forwarded by Katherine Antos/CBP/USEPA/US on 11/03/2010 05:54 PM -----

From: Katherine Antos/CBP/USEPA/US  
To: David.Johnson@dcr.virginia.gov, Jeffrey Corbin/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Kelly Shenk/CBP/USEPA/US@EPA, Matt.Conrad@governor.virginia.gov, russ.perkinson@dcr.virginia.gov, Jack Frye <Jack.Frye@dcr.virginia.gov>, Anthony.Moore@governor.virginia.gov  
Date: 11/03/2010 05:54 PM  
Subject: Follow up from this afternoon's VA RMP call

Good afternoon -

Thank you for this afternoon's call on VA's Resource Management Plan (RMP) strategy. As we said on the call, we appreciate VA's efforts to create a performance-based strategy that provides flexibility and could therefore increase farmer participation rates.

The summary of approved BMP efficiencies (including conservation plans) that are in Scenario Builder, as well as the Mid-Atlantic Water Program report that provides the supporting documentation for the conservation plans and other BMP efficiencies, are available for download at:  
<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/watershedimplementationplantools.aspx?menuitem=52044#2>

To summarize the take home message that Matt captured so well at the end of the call:

- EPA and VA agreed that a separate, new BMP for Resource Management Plans is unnecessary; the performance standard will be set by the approved practices in VA's WIP input deck.
  - This remains a performance standard. If farmers choose a different suite of practices to achieve the same nutrient and sediment reductions, that is fine.
  - In an annual progress run, VA would report the actual practices that are implemented through the RMPs
- To have reasonable assurance with the RMP strategy, EPA would expect to see:
  - What the performance standard is based on the WIP input deck (eg, in 2017 a more aggressive standard with fewer farmers participating, or a less aggressive standard with more farmers participating?
  - What is the process for building the RMP strategy into VA's existing programs?
  - Who writes the plan, and how is it developed?
  - Who verifies, tracks and reports plan implementation?
  - What is the timeline for rolling out the RMP strategy, including interim milestones and implementation milestones (eg, 35% of hay and pasture acres covered by RMPs by 2016)?
  - What are the contingency actions (eg, regulations) if not enough farmers enroll in RMPs?
    - Include a schedule and interim milestones for contingency development, knowing that VA can abandon the contingency plan if 2-year milestones demonstrate the RMP approach has enough participation to meet VA's 2017 interim target and 2025 allocations.

EPA is happy to review a draft of this and provide comments. November 12 is our deadline for receiving submissions and providing comments; of course we are happy to review before 11/12.

Thanks again for the productive discussion,  
Katherine

Katherine Wallace Antos  
Chesapeake Bay Program Office  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
410 Severn Ave., Suite 112  
Annapolis, MD 21403

(410) 295-1358